

# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Vignina 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
09/465,056	12/16/1999	ROGER E. WEISS	PARI/981/US	8410
	590 08/15/2003			
BRIAN M. DINGMAN MIRICK, O'CONNELL, DEMALLIE & LOUGEE, LLP 100 FRONT STREET WORCESTER, MA 01608			EXAMINER	
			NGUYEN, TRUC T	
WORCESTER,	, MA 01008		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2833	
			DATE MAILED: 08/15/2003	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)
•		09/465,056	WEISS, ROGER E.
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
		Truc T. T. Nguyen	2833
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication Reply	tion appears on the cov r sheet with th	correspondence address
THE   - Exte after - If the - If NO - Failu - Any I	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICA nsions of time may be available under the provisions of 3 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication of the preriod for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) data of period for reply is specified above, the maximum statuto are to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, reply received by the Office later than three months after the patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	TION. 7 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be cation. ays, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) or y period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from by statute, cause the application to become ABANDO	e timely filed  days will be considered timely.  rom the mailing date of this communication.  DNED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
1)🖂	Responsive to communication(s) filed	on <u>21 May 2003</u> .	
2a)	This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b)	☑ This action is non-final.	
3)□ Dispositi	Since this application is in condition fo closed in accordance with the practice ion of Claims		
· _	Claim(s) <u>1-59</u> is/are pending in the app	Dication.	
-	4a) Of the above claim(s) <u>4,8,13-17,20-</u>		onsideration.
	Claim(s) is/are allowed.		
·	Claim(s) <u>1,2,7-9,12,18,19,23 and 24</u> is/	are rejected.	
· · · · · ·	Claim(s) 3.5 and 6 is/are objected to.	•	
	Claim(s) are subject to restriction	n and/or election requirement.	
	ion Papers	·	
9) 🗌	The specification is objected to by the E	xaminer.	
10) 🔲	The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)[	_ accepted or b)  objected to by the E	xaminer.
	Applicant may not request that any objecti	on to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance.	See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
11)	The proposed drawing correction filed or	n is: a)□ approved b)□ disapp	proved by the Examiner.
	If approved, corrected drawings are requir	ed in reply to this Office action.	
12) 🔲	The oath or declaration is objected to by	the Examiner.	
Priority ι	ınder 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120		
13)	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for	foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119	∂(a)-(d) or (f).
a)	☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:		
	1. Certified copies of the priority do	cuments have been received.	
	2. Certified copies of the priority do	cuments have been received in Applic	ation No
* 5		he priority documents have been rece onal Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). or a list of the certified copies not recei	
14) 🗌 A	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for o	fomestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 11	9(e) (to a provisional application).
	)  The translation of the foreign langua  Acknowledgment is made of a claim for o		
Attachmen		-	
2) D Notic	e of References Cited (PTO-892) of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO- mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper	948) 5) Notice of Inform	nary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) nal Patent Application (PTO-152)
Patent and T	rademark Office	Office Action Summary	Part of Paper No. 18

Page 2

1. The indicated allowability of claims 2, 7 and 9 are withdrawn in view of the newly discovered reference(s) to Lamp (US 4,003,621). Rejections based on the newly cited reference(s) follow.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
  - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 3. Claims 1-2, 7, 9 12, 18, and 23-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lambert et al. (US 4,820,376) in view of Lamp (US 4,003,621.

Regarding claim 1, Lambert et al. disclose a device for electrically interconnecting two or more components, comprising:

an elastomeric matrix (11) having one or more surfaces (12, 13);

a plurality of electrically conductive pathways (see Figure 1) through the matrix including a plurality of conductive particles (10);

Lambert et al. substantially disclose the claimed invention except for a plurality of electrically conductive contact pads integral with the matrix and in electrical contact with the plurality of conductive pathways; wherein at least a portion of one or more of the pads is extended outward from an outer surface.

Lamp teaches a plurality of electrically conductive contact pads (80, 80', 82, 82') in electrical contact with the plurality of conductive pathways (12) and is extended outward from an outer surface (84, 84').

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide a conductive pads into Lambert et al.'s matrix, as taught by Lamp for increasing contact area thus providing better electrical conduction.

Regarding claims 2, 7 and 9, in the modified interconnecting device of Lambert et al. in view of Lamp, Lamp teaches the conductive pads (80, 82) being extended outwardly from the surface (84) by a distance of its thickness. These pads in combination with Lambert's matrix will inherently provide one or more flow spaces that allow a portion of the matrix to enter the flow spaces under a compression force.

Regarding claim 12, in the modified interconnecting device of Lambert et al. in view of Lamp, Lambert et al. disclose one or more of said pathways comprising a plurality of particles (10) aligned to form a column having at least one end, wherein one or more of said pads are in contact with at least one of said ends of one or more of said columns of particles (Figure 2).

Regarding claim 18, in the modified interconnecting device of Lambert et al. in view of Lamp, Lambert et al. disclose one or more pathways comprises a plurality of electrically conductive particles aligned in a column having at least one end particle coated with a metal (17).

Regarding claim 23, in the modified interconnecting device of Lambert et al. in view of Lamp, Lambert et al. further disclose one or more of said pathways comprising a plurality of

Application/Control Number: 09/465,056

Art Unit: 2833

conducting particles aligned in one or more columns having at least one end particle (Figures 1-3).

Regarding claim 24, in the modified interconnecting device of Lambert et al. in view of Lamp, Lamp discloses the outer surface of the matrix comprise a first surface (84) adapted to face one component (un-numbered, a component that bearing a force F shown in Figure 9) and a second surface (84') adapted to face a second component (un-numbered, a component that bearing a force F shown in Figure 9).

4. Claims 10-11 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lambert et al. (US 4,820,376) and Lamp (US 4,003,621) and Applicant's Admitted Prior Art (disclosed in the Background of the Invention section).

Regarding claim 10, the modified interconnecting device of Lambert et al. in view of Lamp substantially disclose claimed invention except the pathways being anisotropic and comprise up to about 25% magnetic particles.

Applicant's APA teaches the conductive pathways being anisotropic.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the conductive pathway of Lambert et al. by a plurality of anisotropic particles, as taught by Applicant's APA for providing compressibility in different direction of the particles.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was to made to provide the pathways comprise up to about 25% magnetic particles, since it has been held that where the general conditions of a claim a are disclosed in the prior art,

discovering the optimum or workable ranges involves only routine skill in the art. In re Aller, 105 USPQ 233.

Regarding claim 11, in the modified interconnecting device of Lambert et al. in view of Lamp and Applicant's APA, Lambert et al. disclose the plurality of the magnetic particle are aligned to formed one or more array of electrically isolated column having at least one end, wherein one or more of said pads is in contact with an end of one or more of said columns of particles (see Figure 1).

Regarding claim 19, the modified interconnecting device of Lambert et al. in view of Lamp substantially disclose the claimed invention except the matrix comprises one or more elastomers which retains about 90% or more of its modulus of compression over a temperature range of between about -50 degree Celsius to 200 degree Celsius.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide about 90% or more of elastomer into the Jin et al's. Since it has been held to be within the general skill of a worker in the art to select a known material on the basis of its suitability for the intended use as a matter of obvious design choice. In re Leshin, 125 USPO 416.

### Allowable Subject Matter

- 5. Claims 3, 5-6 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.
- 6. The following is an examiner's statement of reasons for allowance:

Art Unit: 2833

Regarding claim 3, the prior art of record fails to teach a means for providing the flow spaces comprises one or more compressible microspheres imbedded in said matrix.

Regarding claim 5, the prior art of record fails to teach the means for providing the flow spaces comprises one or more gas particles located in the matrix

Any comments considered necessary by applicant must be submitted no later than the payment of the issue fee and, to avoid processing delays, should preferably accompany the issue fee. Such submissions should be clearly labeled "Comments on Statement of Reasons for Allowance."

## Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments with respect to claim 1 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

#### Conclusion

This is a NON-FINAL office action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Truc T. T. Nguyen whose telephone number is 703-306-4004.

The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Paula Bradley can be reached on 703-308-2319. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-308-7722 for regular communications for After Final communications.

Art Unit: 2833

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-0956.

T. Nguyen

August 11, 2003